FILED

(1)

95 529 OCT 2 1995

CASE No. _____ OFFICE OF THE CLERK

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

OCTOBER TERM 1995

CiV. APP. 95-5021

WILLIAM L.E. PUNCHARD II; V.G. WRIGHT;
LELTON EDWARD; DENSET WILLIAMS;
ROBERT HAYNES; BILLY L. EDWARDS Punchard, Jr

PLAINTIFF-APPEALLANI,

Vs,

THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO; STATE HOSPITAL;
UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT; AN.AL.

DEFENDANTS-APPEALLEES.

PETITION FOR A ORIGINAL JURISDICTION TO THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT ,FROM THE D.C. CIRCUIT APPEALS COURT

PETITION FOR A ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WITH WRIT OF CERTIORARI, WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS

DEFENDANTS COUNSEL
JANET RENO, UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL
CONSTITUTION AVE & 10th STREET
WASHINGTON , D.C.,20530, (202) 514-4371

PLAINTIFFS COUNSEL
WILLIAM PUNCHARD, CROWN/AMBASSADOR PRO TEM
702 WEST FIRST STREET
P.O. BOX 227
DEMING, NEW MEXICO , 88030.(505) 546-4462

RECEIVED
SEP 30 1996
OFFICE OF THE CLERK
SUPREME COURT, U.S.

03 PP

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

A. Where Defendants violated Plaintiffs's BILL OF RIGHTS By REMOVING Federal Public Records of Diplomatic Certification of identification without a Federal Court Order, Yet Conspiring with State to violate FEDERAL Neutrality ACT;

B. WHERE FEDERAL JUSTICE DEPARTMENT Abridged Extra-Territorial Jurisdiction by Picking who will be allowed to work For, and Register as a Foreign Government Agent of Plaintiff's Sovereign Crown Government in America , without a DUE COURT ORDER TO AID State False Imprisonment.

1. WILL THE Supreme Court up-hold The TREATY AGREEMENT Diplomatic Immunity Paragraph by Granting Motion for Release(WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS) Plaintiffs's/Diplomatics from State False Imprisonment and Conspiracy ?

2. WILL the Court up-hold the Plaintiffs-'s Right to be SECURE IN THEIR PAPERS(AGENT's DIPLOMATIC Identification and Certification)

QUESTION PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

Publicly Filed in the Federal Justice department, Foreign Agent's Registration office ?

3. **WILL The Court enjoin The Federal Justice department Registration Clerk to Return and Replace all of Plaintiffs's Diplomatic Identification Papers that were Removed Without a Federal Court Order from 1985-to-1995 ?**

4. **FOR ACTS LESS DUE PROCESS OF FEDERAL LAW**, WILL THE Supreme Court Up-hold the Plaintiff's Right to Constitutional, Article V., Bill of Rights Against the Respondants for Legal and MEDICAL Malpractice, and Conspiracy to Violate Plaintiff's CIVIL RIGHTS ?

5. **Is DEFENDANT VIOLATING Federal Code 1983 (Defendant failed to indict Plaintiff, Holding Eight (8) Years of False-Imprisonment, and a on-going Conspiracy) ?**

6. **will the Court Grant the Plaintiffs a Permonant Injunction** against the Defendants requiring Property Tax against Plaintiff's Foreign Government EMBASSY Property? (ii)

QUESTIONS PRESENTED FOR REVIEW

7. Will the COURT up hold Diplomatic Right and Protection for Childrans of the Core , Because TREATYS, Packs Override State Court ?

8. Will the COURT INJOIN THE Defendants to give Federal Jurisdiction to All Questions of arising Diplomatic Statuts ?

9. Will the COURT Order Protection for the Plaintiff's Government Embassy, eventhough EMBASSY"S Government is the Basis Protector of the Church, Protection from Defendant's State Trusspassing on Embassy Property ?

10. WILL THE COURT ORDER Plaintiff recover directly by way of this Court for the Stolen Drawings, and Inventions; and Paintings taken by Staff, a Justfiable Money Amount ?

11. WILL THE COURT Order Compensation Payed to Plaintiffs Due to Slander, Mal-Practice, False-Imprisonment damages, and Punitive etc ?

DEFENDANTS OF THE CASE

JUDGE SANDRA GRISHAM
NM CR-95-496;497
TWELVETH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
OTERIO COUNTY COURT HOUSE
P.O. BOX 100 N Y
ALMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO 88310

(505)437-7310

Burt ACTKSON, DISTRICT ATTORNEY
P.O. BOX 100Ny
OTERIO COUNTY COURTHOUSE
ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO 88310
(505)-437-3640

MIS. ROCKANN MATISE, ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY
P.O. BOX 100Ny
OTERIO COUNTY COURT HOUSE
ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO, 88310
(505) 437-3640

PLAINTIFF OF THE CASE

MR. EDMON WRITHT(CR-95-496;497)
OTERO, COUNTY(Private) JAIL
ALAMOGORDO, NEW MEXICO 88310

PLAINTIFFS IN THE CASE

CROWN/AMBASSADOR PROTEM, William L E.PUNCHARD

702 WEST FIRST STREET, P.O.BOX 227

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030, (505) 546-4462

ROYAL Minister of Health,De Nest Williams

702 WEST FIRST STREET

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030, (505)546-4462

ROYAL Minister of THE INTERIOR, LELTON EDWARDS

702 WEST First Street

Deming, NEW MEXICO 88030,(505)546-4462

Royal MINISTER OF JUSTICE,BILLY L.EDWARDS

Punchard III.

702 WEST FIRST STREET

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030 , (505)546-4462

ROYAL CONSUL GENERAL, Y.G.Wright

P.O. BOX 227

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030 , (505)546-4462

ROYAL CONSUL, ROBERT HAYNES
P.O. BOX 227
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030,(505)546-4462

MICHEL CONTRERES
NEW MEXICO CORRECTIONS DEPT.
Ph:(505)827-8656(Dona ana County) (V)

DEFENDANTS IN THE CASE

MR. SAM DAVIS, DEMING Police Department
700 East Pine

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030 ,(505)546-8848

MR. TOMAS CLARK, Assistant District Attorney

DONANA COUNTY COURTHOUSE
(505)524-6370
LAS CRUCES , NEW MEXICO 88001

MR. PAUL BARR DE, DEMING CITY POLICEMAN

700 EAST PINE STREET

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030 ,(505)546-8848

SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT ATTORNEY

TONY WHITE Ph:(505)546-0409

700 SOUTH SILVER AVE.

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030

Sixth Judicial District Attorney

Mr. Manual VITAMONTES ,Ph:(505)546-0409

700 SOUTH SILVER AVE.

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030

MR. HENRY QUINTERO,Public Defender
700 SOUTH SILVER AVE. ,Ph:(505)538-2966
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030

DEFENDANTS OF THE CASE

MR. TOMAS STERM Md. Forensic Director

P.O. BOX 1388 Ph:(505)454-2100

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701

Dr. Zaskco, Forensic Director

P.O. BOX 1388 Ph:(505)454-2100

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701

DR. MICHAEL HICKEY ,(505) 439- 2197

Hickey's Medical service

Almagordo, NEW Mexico

Mrs. Sidney Goad,Physiologis

P.O. BOX 1388 Ph:(505)454-2100

Las Vegas ,New Mexico 87701

Dr. Pablo Hernandez. Hospital Director

Ph:(505)454-2100

P.O. BOX 1388

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701

Dr. TOMAS DIKER, Hospital Director

Ph:(505)454-2100

P.O. BOX 1388

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701

DEFENDANTS OF THE CASE

MR. MANUAL SALCADO (Cr-85-36)
SIXTH Judicial Districr Court
700 SOUTH SILVER AVE.
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030, Ph:(505)546-0409

Mr. V. LEE VESELY (CR-93-16)
Sixth Judicial District Court
GRANTS COUNTY COURT HOUSE, PH:(505)538-3250
SILVER CITY, NEW MEXICO 88062,

Mr. Joseph Rich(Cr-93-189-02)
McKINLEY COUNTY COURTHOUSE
Gallup, New Mexico ,(505)863-6816

MR. BENNIE FLORIS(Cr-85-36)
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
1800 New Mexico AVE. ,(505)454-0038
LAS VEGAS , New Mexico 87701

Judge Harris (Cr-85-36)
,(505)454-0038
FOURTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
1800 NEW MEXICO AVE.
LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701

DEFENDANTS OF THE CASE

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY GENERAL'S OFFICE
UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, Park Place

CONSTITUTION AVE, AND 10th. Street N.W.

WASHINGTON , D.C. 20530 ,(202)514-4371

MR. FRED CLOUSE(Justice Department Clerk)

REGISTRATION DIVISION

CONSTITUTION AVE.& 10th Street N.W.

WASHINGTON ,D.C. 20530 ,Ph:(202)514-4371

MR. RD. SHARP(JUSTICE DEPARTMENT CLERK)

REGISTRATION DIVISION

CONSTITUTION AVE.,& 10th Street

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20530 ,Ph:(202)514-4371

President of the United States

MR. BILL CLINTON

1600 Pennsylvia Ave.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20500 ,Ph/Fax:(202)456-2983

NEW MEXICO STATE GOVERNOR"S Office

New Mexico CAPITAL BLD.,Ph:(505)827-3000

P.O. drawer 1508

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504 ,

DEFENDANTS OF THE CASE

CITY OF DEMING/POLICE DEPARTMENT

700 SOUTH PINE STREET ,Ph(505)546-8848

DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030

(Cr-85-36)

MR. JOHN GATTLINE, DR. (Cr-85-36)

P.O. BOX 1388 ,Ph:(505)454-2100)

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701

MR. TOM UDALL(STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL)

p.o. DRAWER 1508 ,Ph:(505)827-6000

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87504

MR RUDY GRANEO (Forensic Director 1986)

P.O. BOX 1388 ,Ph:(505)454-2100)

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701 (Cr-85-36)

DR. VAN ORDAN MD

P.O. BOX 1388 ,Ph:((505)454-2100)

(CR-85-36)

LAS VEGAS, NEW MEXICO 87701

JUDGE WOODY SMITH (CR-92-1119)

SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT ,P.O. BOX 415
ALBUQUEQUER, NEW MEXICO 87102. (X)

INDEX

Headings	Pages
INDEX Of ISSUES	xi,
QUESTIONS FOR THE COURT....	i,ii,iii,iv.
ATTORNEYS OF THE CASE.....	APP.14
Cirtification of service.....	APP.15
DEFENDANTS OF THE CASE..	v,vi,vii,viii, iv.
COURT JURIEDICTION.....	xii
LOWER COURT DATES	Xii
PREMISSION TO PROCEED	a.
RULES 902	b.
RULES 1005	c.
CONSTITUTION Privision raised...	d.
HISTORY OF CASE.....	1,2,3,4,
STATEMENTS OF THE CASE...	5,6,7,8,9,10
ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING..	11,12,13,14,15,16
Conclusions.....	17,18
DAMAGES CAUSED BY Defendants.....	18
HABEAS CORPUS Motion	APP.12.
Individul Justice.....	APP.13.
APPEAL COURT ORDER.....	APP.1.
State Court Order 93-189-02(EXHIBIT A)	APP.4
State Court Order 85-36.. (EXHIBIT A.b)	APP.2,3
Justice Department Letter.....(Exhibit B,C)	APP.5,6
Plaintiff Letter(EXHIBIT D)	APP.7,8.
DRAWING	APP.16,17,18.
FEDERAL RULES (EXHIBIT F)	APP.11.

COURT JURISDICTION

The honorable court has Jurisdiction . Pursuant to FEDERAL CODE28 U.S.C.§ 1251; THE UNITED STATE CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE III, (2); and the American Constitution,Bill of Rights: ARTICLE V,;ARTICLE VI: ARTICLE XIV ;Article XIII.,is the Bases upon whitch the case May Apply. Plaintiffs filed 12,20,1994 District gave Orders 12,22,1994. Case Appealed TIMELY, Docketed 01,31,1995, and Court Ordered 08,02,1995. Case Filed in SUPREME COURT 10,02,1995.

The UNITED STATES STATE DEPARTMENT IS NOT A PARTY TO THIS COMPLAINT.

DATE OF LOWER COURT DISPOSITION

CV.APP.-95-5021---08,02,1995 --APP.1.
CIV.-94-02736-----12,12,1994;
STATE:Cr-85-36---App.2.,3.;
STATE: Cr-93-189-02---App.4.;
STATE: Cr-93-16---APP.10;
STATE: CR-92-1119---App. 3.a.;
STATE: CR-95-496; cr-95-497;

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

IN THE MATTER OF
THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WRIT:
CASE CIV.APP. 95-5021: CONspiracy,
and Medical Mal-Practice, HABEAS CORPUS:

WILLIAM L.E. PUNCHARD II, LELTON EDWARDS,
Y.G.WRITE,DENEST WILLIAMS, ROBERT HAYNES,
BILLY L. Punchard III,

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,
Vs,
THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO, STATE Hospital,
UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, AN AL,
RESPONDANTS.

PETITION TO PROCEED IN

A ORIGINAL JURISDICTION : RULE 17.3.

COME NOW, THE PLAINTIFF AND ATTORNEY IN THE ABOVE NAMED CASE AND STYLE MOVING THE HONORABLE COURT with a petition to proceed in a Original jurisdiction and International Matter. The granting of the Petition is consistent with National LAW AND RIGHT, AND IT WILL NOT PREJUDICE THE RESPONDANTS IN ANY WAY.

Plaintiff thank the Honorable Court.

Billy Lloyd Edwards Punchard II

PETITIONOR-PLAINTIFF-PRO SE.

filed in a public office, or a purported public record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, is from the public office where items of this nature are kept.

(8) Ancient documents or data compilation.—Evidence that a document or data compilation, in any form, (A) is in such condition as to create no suspicion concerning its authenticity, (B) was in a place where it, if authentic, would likely be, and (C) has been in existence 20 years or more at the time it is offered.

(9) Process or system.—Evidence describing a process or system used to produce a result and showing that the process or system produces an accurate result.

(10) Methods provided by statute or rule.—Any method of authentication or identification provided by Act of Congress or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority.

Rule 902. Self-authentication

Extrinsic evidence of authenticity as a condition precedent to admissibility is not required with respect to the following:

(1) Domestic public documents under seal.—A document bearing a seal purporting to be that of the United States, or of any State, district, Commonwealth, territory, or insular possession thereof, or the Panama Canal Zone, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or of a political subdivision, department, officer, or agency thereof, and a signature purporting to be an attestation or execution.

(2) Domestic public documents not under seal.—A document purporting to bear the signature in his official capacity of an officer or employee of any entity included in paragraph (1) hereof, having no seal, if a public officer having a seal and having official duties in the district, or political subdivision of the officer or employee certifies under seal that the signer has the official capacity and that the signature is genuine.

(3) Foreign public documents.—A document purporting to be executed or attested in his official capacity by a person authorized by the laws of a foreign country to make the execution or attestation, and accompanied by a final certification as to the genuineness of the signature and official position (A) of the executing or attesting person, or (B) of any foreign official whose certificate of genuineness of signature and official position relates to the execution or attestation or is in a chain of certificates of genuineness of signature and official position relating to the execution or attestation. A final certification may be made by a secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, consul, vice consul, or consular agent of the United States, or a diplomatic or consular official of the foreign country assigned or accredited to the United States. If reasonable opportunity has been given to all parties to investigate the authenticity and accuracy of official documents, the court may, for good cause shown, order that they be treated as presumptively authentic without final certification or permit them to be evidenced by an attested summary with or without final certification.

miniatures, or by mechanical or electronic re-recording, or by chemical reproduction, or by other equivalent techniques which accurately reproduces the original.

Rule 1002. Requirement of Original

To prove the content of a writing, recording, or photograph, the original writing, recording, or photograph is required, except as otherwise provided in these rules or by Act of Congress.

Rule 1003. Admissibility of Duplicates

A duplicate is admissible to the same extent as an original unless (1) a genuine question is raised as to the authenticity of the original or (2) in the circumstances it would be unfair to admit the duplicate in lieu of the original.

Rule 1004. Admissibility of Other Evidence of Contents

The original is not required, and other evidence of the contents of a writing, recording, or photograph is admissible if—

(1) Originals lost or destroyed.—All originals are lost or have been destroyed, unless the proponent lost or destroyed them in bad faith; or

(2) Original not obtainable.—No original can be obtained by any available judicial process or procedure; or

(3) Original in possession of opponent.—At a time when an original was under the control of the party against whom offered, he was put on notice, by the pleadings or otherwise, that the contents would be a subject of proof at the hearing, and he does not produce the original at the hearing; or

(4) Collateral matters.—The writing, recording, or photograph is not closely related to a controlling issue.

Rule 1005. Public Records

The contents of an official record, or of a document authorized to be recorded or filed and actually recorded or filed, including data compilations in any form, if otherwise admissible, may be proved by copy, certified as correct in accordance with rule 902 or testified to be correct by a witness who has compared it with the original. If a copy which complies with the foregoing cannot be obtained by the exercise of reasonable diligence, then other evidence of the contents may be given.

Rule 1006. Summaries

The contents of voluminous writings, recordings, or photographs which cannot conveniently be examined in court may be presented in the form of a chart, summary, or calculation. The originals, or duplicates, shall be made available for examination or copying, or both, by other parties at reasonable time and place. The court may order that they be produced in court.

Rule 1007. Testimony or Written Admission of Party

Contents of writings, recordings, or photographs may be proved by the testimony or deposition of the party against whom offered or by his written admission, without accounting for the nonproduction of the original.

C)

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS RAISED

UNITED STATES CONSTITUTION, ARTICLE III, Paragraph 2.,...Discrepancy Between State and a Ministers of a Foreign State...APP.12.

FEDERAL CODE 28 U.S.C.S 1251, ...The United States Supreme Court has Exclusive Jurisdiction...

UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT Authoritys

United States, V, BELMONT BANK 301 U.S. 324 (1937), Opinion of Justice SOUTHLAND,... Treaty is Retroactive.....12,13.

MISSOURI, V, HOLLAND 252 U.S. 416 (1920), Opinion of Justice HOLMES,...Treaty may OverRides.....11.

TREATY AND AGREEMENT,..Opened Diplomatic Relations... Both Party Diplomatic Immunity...

AMERICAN Federal Neutrality Act,... (Forbad Overthrow of a Government Friendly to the United States)... .....1.b.

FEDERAL RULE OF EVIDENCE:RULE 902.,1005.

LEGAL AND Medical Mal-Practice under the color of law APP.2.-

TAX on FOREIGN GOVERNMENT"S EMBASSYS.

HISTORY OF THE CASE

ON 3/28/1985 Respondants Internationaly Invaded Plaintiff's Certified Foreign Government Embassy. Using a State Warrent with alleged claims all inside Plaintiff's Embassy Jurisdiction. Respondants's International Force arrested by Force the Plaintiff inside the Overt Posted Foreign Government Embassy . Plaintiff being the Embassy's Jurisdictional Representative (HEAD OF STATE). There was Never a Indictment had. Respondants finding Plaintiff a Foreign Agent at first refused jurisdiction. Later Court changed positions to conspire against Federal Code 28 U.S.C.§1251 (Original Jurisdiction being Constitutional) . Plaintiff was Falsely Imprisoned in a State Hospital where he Protest throug the Courts for 3 Years.

In 1985 the U.S. JUSTICE DEPARTMENT DID (Registration Division for Foreign Agents ; act without a Federal Court Order to removed Plaintiff's Diplomatic Document to Aid the Overt Conspiracy to violate the Federal NEUTRALITY Act.

HISTORY OF THE CASE

VIOLATING Plaintiff's Civil Rights dayly . By 1993 the Defendants had let go of William L. Punchard-Plaintiff. "AFTER EIGHT (8) years. In 1993 Other Agents of Plaintiff's Foreign Government had Fallen Pray to the Local State Government and Because there is NO CRIGINAL AGENTS DOCUMENTS ON FEDERAL FILES THE Agents were Protected Pursuant to Treaty. Within the year 1993 and 1994 two Agents have become intangle with the Local Defendants. The State Department is not a Party herein Other Agents are Placed in danger of False Imprisonment for Mis-Representation of a Foreign Government. The Agent Mr, Haynes Was Unduly False imprisoned because there was no Records Of Agency. Mr. Haynes is A EMBASSY ATTACHE. Mr. Billy L. Edwards ,Jr was Entraped by the Defendants in his owne Home in a failed attempt to Make a entrapment on Elegal Drugs.. Mr. Billy L. Edwards is a Prince/Crown Minister of Justice.

All so the Defendants (State)is refusing Application for Embassy Tax Stattus Exemptions.

HISTORY OF THE CASE

Discrimination on Registration of Agents is did by the Clerks-Dcfendants. This Removal of the Federal Public Records with out a Court Order has caused the Local GOVERNMENT Defendant to denie Protection to the Embassy and the Childran of the Embassy. Such a request for Child Protection was made by the Plaintiffs on October of 1994 or so, to the Local District Attorney-Defendant because of a Known Criminal Person given the wrong kind of attention to a 17 year old (a Princess). The Person (man) is 48 years old. The Defendant (Local) refused to give aid to stop the Unlawful Act. When the District Attorney -Defendant send the Refusal to the Plaintiff by a City PoliceMan the Policeman Assulted the Plaintiff-Diplomat. This caused Just another Complaint (A Definate STATEMENT) Number 3. All Because the Federal Record of Identification of Agents was Removed unlawfully.

BECAUSE THIS IS A ACT THAT BEREAKS THE Treaty. The Plaintiffs is greeved, (3)

HISTORY OF THE CASE

The Application for, the Plaintiff's Government Embassy's Property , Tax Exemptions was made after Nine(9) years of contributing aid to the local School District. The Defendants Tax Board (Protest 94-6) Denied the Asked for Exemptions . The Embassy was Registard in the Notice of Agent Registration . The Same Diplomatic Identifications that was removed by the Defendant in the Federal Justice Department ,and Thay Had no Court Order to remove Such.

Plaintiff Government EMBASSY was Criminaly Invaded by the Defendants in 1985,without a FEDERAL Warrant. The Defendants finding themSelfs without a Federal Status then moved to declair the Plaintiff to be Incompetent to be able to Pressure Plaintiff to Sign Away his Diplomatic Position. This did not Work,and after EIGHT YEARS (8) A INDICTMENT WAS NEVER HAD . The Subject Of Compentancy was never ever raised by the Plaintiff. All Requested taking of Test were denied by Plaintiff. The Public Defender was Placed in front of

HISTORY OF THE CASE

Plaintiff-Diplomat to Front off inquirary about the Legal Grounds. This lasted eight Years. Against a Diplomat Mal-Practice DID. The most Criminal part of the matter is that the TENTH Judicial Federal District Court did aid in the Conspiracy ,and It's APPEALS Court. Thus" this made it easy for the Conspirators. Plaintiffs come to Court Seeking Justice.

Statements OF THE Case

1. ALL ARREST OF JUDGEMENT MOTIONS WERE DENIED. The Defendants Know that the Federal Supreme Court is a long way from the State of New Mexico, When ever the matter reach the High Court Often times the Matter is Squashed by the Clerks for some reason or another. In the Present Case,the Matter is being brought before the Court UNDER THE COLOR OF LAW, AND NOT PURSUANT TO SOME Act of Terriorism . Such as the Defendants have did to the Plaintiff. Please See:(EXHIBIT I)

Compensation due Plaintiff for Paintings and Drawings should be given Judicial Notice.

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

1. FEDERAL RECORD TAMPERING, AND REMOVING OF Documents by the **Defendants(Clerk) without** a Official Federal Court order is a Criminal Act. The Justice Department has No leave to Determind or Chouse Presidential Intern -ational Policy making jurisdiction. In the **Present Case** the Justice Department **Hateful** Clerks remove and Blocked Registration of the Plaintiffs Documents to Protect the State Defendants in there failure to comply with the FEDERAL CODE 28 U.S.C.A.§ 1251,did (ORIGINAL Exclusive Jurisdictions of **Supreme Court**). Discrimination by Blocking. See: (EXHIBIT C).

2. Federal Justice Department aid to the Defendants(State) caused the Plaintiffs to **be Terriorised** under the Color of Law. That Terrorism is yet being Supported by Mr. Fred Clouse and Mr, Sharp of the Registration Department Division in the Federal Justice. Such Discrimination against Plaintiffs is a

Violation of

Rights Act (hendering the Right to Work based on National Orgin.) With out a Proper Agent's Registration Pursuant to the Federal Code Plaintiffs Cannot Represent his Foreign Government. Def endants Suffer from the Doctrine of None-Delagation(No Congress or State Department International Policy Jurisdictional.) . Please See: (EXHIBIT C).

3. FEDERAL NEUTRALITY ACT IS A BAR TO THE Defendants Blocking and Removial of Federaly required Registrations of Declaired Foreign Government Agents. It's not a Frivolous Violation of this Act by the Defendants.

4. The Removal of Federal Records by the Defendants has caused the up-seting of the Plaintiffs's Government's Financial Stability ,in terms of Dets and Accounts Recieveable.

TWO DEFENDANTS IN THE Federal Conspirators has did this unlawful Act that deprived the Plaintiffs's Agents of Diplomatic Protection and Treaty Agreements. Please See:(EXHIBIT D)

5. the Plaintiff should be Reembursed .

STATEMENTS OF THE CASE

6. This matter has deVeloped FOUR DEFINATE STATEMENTS, , From 1985 to 1995.

1. The Consiparcy to over-throw by False IM PRISONMENT, and VIOLATED 28 U.S.C.A.§ 1251.

2. HOSPITAL STAFF STEALING Plaintiff's Drawing of Invention and Paintings.

3. Police Invasion ;and Brutalitie against the Plaintiffs and their Families.

4. Defendants Court TAXATION ON FOREIGN GOV-ERNMENT EMBASSY'S PROPERTY DECLARED.

7. In each case and Violation the Plaintiffs have suffered from the FEDERAL Records being Unlawfuly Removed, and most cases has caused real False Imprisonment.
Defendants with the Federals Helping them has unlawfuly Medicated the Plaintiffs With Drugs.

8. The MOTION CALLING FOR Permonent Injunction is a Urgently Needed Motion for Protection for all agents and RELEASE FORM DEFENDANT.

Statements of the Case

9. In the First case of InVasion And False-Imprisonment there was Never a Official Indic-Ment , Nor Execution of the original Warrant was ever did by Defendants.

Defendants knowing that the Federal Lay held the Original and exclusive Jurisdiction in this Matter of March 28 to Febuary 23,1993.

10. The Removial of the Federal Records was did to cover and give aid to the State's run Conspirac, to hold the Plaintiff -Diplomat in hopes of cirventing the federal Code 28 U.S.C.A. 1251.

Deffendant's State CONGRESS Pass a New law Localy called the Billy Edwards Law to try to Cover up the Kidnaping and Conspiracy Act.

11. Other Plaintiffs-Diplomats in 1993-1994 are yet Falling Victim to the Defendants-Justice Department's unlawful taking of the Federal RECORDS FROM THE Agents's Registration Files.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

12. The Plaintiffs Object to the Defendants using their State held Political Offices to Extorting Money from Plaintiffs, Pursuant to Unlawful COURT Rulings by Defendants, for Actions Caused by CHILDRAN OF THE Diplomatic Core. Defendants being a Named Defendant is incapable of EQUAL Justice , and allready Suffer FROM THE DOCTRINE OF NONE-Delagation. (no FEDERAL jurisdiction to hold a Original)

13. Because there is a on going TREATY AND AGREEMENT UNDER NEGOTIATION ,the State has No Prevailing International Statuts Nor a Constitutional Treaty Making Jurisdiction herein, The State Jurisdiction is Overrided by TREATY And Agreements ,In Private Relation.

14. The Unlawful Invasion of Plaintiffs's Registred Government EMBASSYS , and OutRight Kidnaping of Diplomats using State Warrants is Rulling, Terriorism, And Criminal Truspass on a International Scale. Defendants have no EXTRA-Territorial Jurisdiction , Regardless.

STATEMENT OF CASE

A. MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT #1.: ....Page 1.

Recovary ,and REFILE of

Plaintiffs's Diplomatic Identification.

Where Defendant Acted to aid the State

Defendants Violate Plaintiffs's Civil

Rights to the Constitutional Protection to

be Secure in his Papers , and Person. In

this case Safty in Plaintiffs's Diplomatic

Immunity Status , and duties to Represent

A Foreign Government.

Removal of Federal Public Record without

a Federal Court Order. Act that Cause the

Federal Neutrality Act to be Abridged

by the Defendants.

B. MORE DEFINATE STATEMENT #1.1.:...Page 2.

Defendant failed to comply with the

FEDERAL Code 28 U.S.C.§ 1251 in all the

encounters where the Federal Court had the

Original Jurisdiction (CR-92-1119 ; 95-169-

02 ; CR-93-16). THIS Defendant did not have

Jurisdiction in what is a Diplomatic and

(10.a)

STATEMENT OF CASE

B. MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT #1. .....Page 1.

Federal Case. In Case Cr-85-36 Defendants Did not have a Required Federal INDICTMENT, and when the Subject came up the State Defendants Kidnaped Plaintiff and did do MEDICAL, Legal MAL PRACTICE AT STATE Hospital. This Violated Federal Neutrality Act.

A. MORE DEFINATE STATEMENT # 3. ....Page 3.

The Local District Attorney, and District Court(Defendants all) has denied the real Protection aloted the Public. The Lack Of due Proicess of Equal Protection.

Where Childran of the Diplomat and the Other Diplomats's Family(Girls) Went to a Basket Ball Game and, Became involved in a Fray With out of Town Girls. Out of town Girls Lost the Fray and became injuryed. The School being involved and had concerns of Insurance Suits. Where the Court was Given Notice of the Diplomatic Status of the Young Girls. Where the Court Ruled in faver of the outer Towners, School.(10.b)

STATEMENT OF CASE

Bias Court Ruling in Federal Court Matters Because the Defendants have removed the Diplomatic Records. SEE :CH-94-33;CH 95-34.

B. MORE DEFINATE STATEMENT # 3. .....PAGE 3.

The LACK OF DUE PROCESS Protection for Agent's Childran (Girls) against Known Felon Molesting Under Age (17)childrans Local Defendants with holding Protection with the Intent to Create Dangerous Fight between the Felon and the Plaintiff(Defendants doing so in the Hope that they might escape Justice if this occured in Blood). Plaintiff is now holding the Local Defendants Responsible for the Damages did by the 45 year old felon. City Police Assaulted the Plaintiff whild delivering the District Attorney's disposition rejection of the Matter. Policeman tryed to cover Up assault by CHARGING DISORDERLY CONDUCT. City Court found Plaintiff Not Guilyt. Case # 976155 Municipal. City Court advised Plaintiff to go to the District Attorney to Make the ORIGINAL REQUEST FOR Help in Matter. Police BRUTALITY, KIDNAPING A Diplomat. (10.c)

STATEMENT OF CASE

A. MORE DEFINITE STATEMENT #2. .....Page 4.

Plaintiff while being Falsely Imprisoned in the State hospital, he drew and mailed two inventions out to Plaintiff's Foreign Governme-nt Embassy. But the Hospital Staff Never did Mail the Inventions out of the Hospital. Just as the Staff never did Mail Two Hand-Panted Canves Picturs, and Over a One Hundred ($100. \Dollars worth of Mail(at 26¢)that was serpose to be Mail . SEVEN YEARS LATER THE Plaintiff yet being handed OLD MAIL ,BUT None had the Named Inventions nor the Large Western Canves hand painting. Please SEE:(EXHIBIT L,J,AND K). Six Years after the Mailed Inventions Failed to be mailed ,the Invention shows up on tele-vesion (Shoes with a Light in the Hill).

The Second Invention (a Auto tire that is made in sections) has been showing up on as Now a ENGLISH INVENTION ON Tele-Vision.

The State Staff that claim to have mail All Mail opened the Plaintiff's Mail and Stole The invention . Please(SEE:(EXHIBIT L).

(10.d)

STATEMENT OF CASE

A. MORE DEFINATE STATEMENT, #4.....Page 5.

The Plaintiff has applied for Foreign Government Embassy TAX EXEMPTION. DEFENDANTS REJECTED THE Application. Defendant is reliying on the United States Justice Department Defendants Conspiracy to Block any Official Statuts(to save any need to face Justice in the Present Complaint) TAX EXEMPTIONS.

If the Tax Office Acknowledge the Embassy Tax Exemption the Defendants to this Complaint will have been abandan.

Thus' the Application was turn down by the Review Board. Protest 94-6.

Plaintiff holds that No Foreign Embassy is a part of the Defendant's Government, and the Defendants have no EXTRA-TERRITORIAL JURISDICTION TO LEVEY State Taxation on a Regestard Foreign GOVERNMENT EMBASSY Property. Please See: (EXHIBIT F).

ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING

1. The Childran of all Agents and other Diplomats are under the Protection of the American Constitution because Treaty Making Power is a EXCLUSIVE FEDERAL JURISDICTION. Pursuant to MISSOURI, Vs, HOLLAND ,252 U.S. 416 (1920) ..Opinion of Justice Holmes...

> ...No doubt the great body of private relation usually fall within the control of the State, But a Treaty may override its power....

In the Present case,the Childran and All the Diplomats are under the Protection of Treaty and Agreement on going.

By the Time the Supreme Court receive this Petition the Plaintiffs now being False Imprisoned Might be Out, Never the less, We ,Plaintiffs Petition for A Writ of Habeas Corpus to Wipe out any Public Posted Convictions placed on any of the Political Diplomatic Core and their Familys. By Reason that Defendant Suffer from Doctrine of None-Delagation (having no Federal Original Jurisdicional Rights against FOREIGN Diplomatsl. (11)

ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING PETITION

RULE 14.1.(j).

1. PURSUANT TO Federal Rule of Evidence:RULE 902 (Self authentication), RULE 1005(Public Record),and the Foreign Agent Registration Presented to the Respondands on a court level and a Governor Level is all the Diplomatic Identification Required. Please See(EXHIBIT f)

In 1985 the Defendants Violated the Federal Neutrallity Act by the Kidnaping of the Plaintiff .Please SEE:(EXHIBIT A(b)) .

2. Pursuant to the Federal Code 28 U.S.C. § 1251 Respondants Violated Congress, and Violated the Federal Neutrality Act in trying to Hold the Original Jurisdiction and to Overthrow the Plaintiff and tipping the Balance of Power Internationaly. There is no way to say Terrorism did by the Respondants other than "NEGLIGENT",and "UNETHICAL".

3. Pursuant to AMERICAN Supreme CourT ,in case United States , v, BELMONT BANK 301 U.S. 324 (1937), Opinion by Justice Southerland... We ARE OF [the] opinion

ARGUEMENT FOR GRANTING

that no state policy can prevail against the international compact here involved. ...and in respect of our foreign relations generally, state lines disappear. As to such purposes the State of (name) does not exist. ... ...And in respect of what was done here, the Executive had authority to speak as the sole organ of that government. (EXHIBIT E).

IN THE PRESENT CASE the American Justice Department should not have Joined the State's Conspiracy to Attempt to over throw Plaintiff by removing the Federal Public Record on File.

Respondant International Jurisdictional Act Violated the American's Monrow Doctrine ; the Federal Neutrality Act (Attempting to over throw a Government under Negotiating Treaty that is Friendly to the United States of America). PLEASE SEE: (Exhibit B).

4. THE DEFENDANTS did not have a Court's Order to remove Certifications. Plaintiff's Representative ARE DEPRIVED. See(EXHIBIT B,C).

ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING Petition

RULE 14.1.(j).

5. THE United states Constitution, (Bill of Rights)grants the Protection of ones Papers and Property .
The Removial of The Plaintiffs's Private and Public Documents from a Federal File is a Criminal Act , Because there was No Showing of Probable Cause, and No Federal COURT ORDER TO Remove . United States Constitutional, ARTICLE IV, Bill of Rights .

6. Because the Documents were Filed by a Government Agent the Filing was Protected by The United States Constitution ,(Bill of FourTeenth Amendment (Protection to Foreign Persons).

7. ALL PLAINTIffs in this Case have been unlawfuly Deprived of Justice , Freedom or Both . Defendants Removal of Federal Public Records Circumvented the Federal CODE 28 U.S. C.§ 1251 (Supreme Court JURISDICTION)
Please See:(Exhibit A(b),),(Exhibit A)

8. State Defendants Court Orders (to

ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING Petition

8.

Plaintiff Diplomat-William L. Punchard II)

Ordered Medication was a International Act of American (State) Terriorism. UNDER THE Treaty and Agreement Paragraph the Diplomatic Protection is not allowed to be Waved. Foreign Government Agents are not to be Forced to take Medication Nor be detained for More than Necessary to make Identification. The Eight Years (8) caused to Plaintiff-William L. Punchard II(AKA.Billy L. Edwards, Senior)in 1985 to 1993, and the other Plaintiffs - Mr. Robert Haynes, Billy Edwards,Jr. , and the Minor was directly caused by the Removal of the Public Records, and the Refusal to accept the Diplomatic Document by the Justice Department Registration Clerks,MR. Sharp , Mr. Fred clouse. PLEASE SEE: (EXHIBIT C).

9. Being Removed IN Person by the Defendants to a Prison served only to cause the Overthrow of Plaintiff's Government , and Deprive Plaintiff of the State of Africa (NaMibia) by holding.-

ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING

10. Lacking AUTHORITY GRANTED TO THEM FROM THE United States ,Nor from the Plaintiff's Continental Crown Government to Discriminate.

The Criminal Trusspass by the Respondant inside of the Plaintiff's Government Embassy was a act of war. Such actions of False-Imprisonment by the Respondants should be Prosecuted by this Honorable American Supreme Court, or turned over to the Plaintiff's Government,or what ever the Honorable Court see Properly with their confindment. Date 1995, Federal Agents Respondants yet keeps the Plaintiffs's Records removed Court's should have known that a FOREIGN Embassy is not within the jurisdiction of a State Court Warrants nor for Taxation of the Plaintif's Foreign Government Embassy Property. Please See: (Exhibit A).

11. Because the Record of the American Supreme Court is Consistent with Justice time and time Again , The Plaintiff will Adopt Same In American Diplomatic Matters. (16)

ARGUMENTS FOR GRANTING

12. Warrants don't say State or Federal Government are International Police forces. The Plaintiff's jurisdiction Extends to all of it's Diplomatic Familys and such Diplomats and or Agents. This is Treaty Stated. The Plaintiff is not at war with the Honorable Court's Government. Thus ' the HABEAS Corpus should be granted Pursuant to and in protection of the American Constitution ,Article III, Paragraph 2.,Se.2. .

Defendants Holding Original Jurisdiction is prohibated) Federal Code 28 U.S.C.§ 1251. See:(EXHIBIT I)

CONCLUSIONS

THE Plaintiff IS A International GOVERNMENT BEFORE THE Invasion of the Certified Foreign Continental Government EMBASSY. Plaintiff's SOVEREIGNTY and Jurisdiction is sole authority over any business inside of His Registared Foreign Embassy and Conected Agents there off. Habeas Corpus should be granted Pursuant to Treaty and Agreement; Return of Records should be Court Ordered.(17

CONCLUSION

In the present case here is a Head of State that has Pined on a Court of Law having the Exclusive Jurisdiction to Redress Matters(whome is Small like so many other Foreign Government) this is a example to the World; The required Federal Action here was comper-mised by the Conspiracy; No Indictment Means Kidnaping, Records show Defendant's /Med-ical Mal-Practice was a shamb to Circumvent Federal Disclosure; Defendants have no Jurisd-iction inside Plaintiff Registard Government Embassy ,Nor any Tax Claims due; The TREATY AND AGREEMENT SHOULD HAVE BEEN A RECONIZED BARR TO Defendants District Court Jurisdiction;

DAMAGES

Plaintiffs ask the Court for Registration;

$ 150,000,000.00 for the Medical Mal-Practice;

$ 150,000,000.00 For Slander and Brutality;

$ 200,000,000.00 for False Imprisonment ;

$ 200,000,000.00 PUNITIVE AWARD OR WHATEVER THE Honorable Court Think is Justice and Right;
-- A BLANKET WRIT OF HABEA CORPUS FOR ALL.
Plaintif thank the Honorable Court.

6/12/96 (18) William L Weaver

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

For The District of Columbia Circuit

No. 95-5021 September Term, 1994

94cvo2736

William L.E. Punchard, II

Appeallant,

V.

State of New Mexico, et al

BeFORE: Silberman, Ginsburg, and Sentelle, Circuit Judges

O R D E R

UPON consideration of the response to the Court's order to show cause filed may 11, 1995,.....

ORDERED that the Order to show cause be discharged.

FURTHER ORDERED, THAT the motion for Writ of habeas corpus be dismissed for lack of Jurisdiction.

The Clerk is directed to withhold issuance of the Mandate herein seven days...

Per curiam

(APP. 1)

SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (EXHIBIT A,b)

LUNA COUNTY, NEW MEXICO

State of NEW MEXICO,)
Plaintiff,)
vs,)
BILLY EDWARDS) Cr-85-36
Defendant.)

Order FOR FORENSIC COMMITMENT

THIS matter having come befor the Court on a Stipulation for Forensic Commitment by and between Tomas T. Clark, Deputy District Attorney for the State of New Mexico, and HENRY R. Quintero, Attorney for the Defendant, Court having reviewed the said Stipulation and Attached Forensic Evaluation Dated October 7, 1985, and having found that the Defendant is not presently Competent to Stand Trial in this matter ; IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant be committed to the Forensic Division of the New Mexico State Hospital, Las Vegas

(EXHIBIT A,b)

New Mexico for further evaluation and Treatment to enable the Defendant to attain Competency to stand trial.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that, upon Notification of Defendant's Completion of Treatment at the Forensic Division of the New Mexico Hospital, the Sheriff of Luna County or his Duly Authorized agent shall transport the Defendant back to Luna County Correctional Facility, Deming, New Mexico to remain in Custody.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED That further proceedings in this matter are stayed until such time as defendant is found to be competent to stand trial.

Date this 15 th day of October, 1985

S/_____

MANUAL D.V. SAUCEDO
DISTRICT JUDGE, DIVISION II

SECOND JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT (EXHIBIT A.C)
COUNTY OF BERNAILLO
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

No. CRCR 92-1119 (DA#: 92-1457-01)

STATE OF NEW MEXICO
PLAINTIFF,
Vs,

MICHALE CONTRERAS,
DEFENDANT.

AMENDED

JUDGEMENT, SENTENCE AND COMMITMENT

On November 7, 1995 this case came before the Honorable W. C. Woody Smith, District Judge, for resentencing upon Mandate from the Superme Court of the State of New Mexico , the State appearing by CECELIA NIEMCZYK, Deputy District Attorney , the Defendant appearing personally and by his attorney David Eisenberg, and the Defendant having been convicted on May 3, 1993, pursuant to a Jury Verdict of :

1. Felony Murder, a Felony Offense occuring on or about May 14,1992, as

(APP.3.a)

charge in Alternative Count 1 of Cr 92-1119; The Defendant is hereby found and adjudged guilty and convicted of said crime, and is sentenced to the custody of the Corrections Department to be Imprisoned for the term of life Imprisonment as to the felony Murder conviction,

THERFORE, You, the Corrections Departmeent of the State of New Mexico are hereby Commanded to take the above-named Defendant in Custody and confine him for the above term of Thirty-One and One-Half (31½) Years.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that the Defendant be placed on parole for Five (5) years after release and be required to pay Parole Coste.

S/_____
W.C. WOODY SMITH
DISTRICT JUDGE

APPROVED:

S/ CECELIA NIEMCZYK
ASSISTANT DISTRICT ATTORNEY
Approved as to form only/DAVID EISENBERG
12/29/95 ; 2512/vcm

(EXHIBIT A)

ELEVENTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT
COUNTY OF McKINLEY
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

FILE
APR 11 2o8PM'94

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,
Plaintiff,

Vs, No.cr-93-169-02

BILLY L. EDWARDS,Jr.
Defendant.

ORDER

IT IS THE ORDER of the Court that the Defendant be taken into custody and held in the McKinley County Jail until further order of the Court.

S/----------
JOSEPH L. RICH
DISTRICT JUDGE

(EXHIBIT B)

Discussion with Billy Lloyd Edwards, a patient at the New Mexico State Hospital, concerning his registration under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended.

SEP 10 1985

FILES

(EXHIBIT B)
Robert D. Sharp
Attorney
Registration Unit
Internal Security

On September 4, 1985, I was asked to speak to a Mr. Billy Edwards "Puchard" concerning a possible registration matter. Mr. "Puchard" stated that he was trying to determine the status of his registration under the Foreign Agents Act. He claimed to represent a foreign government, the Royal Democratic States of Continental Africa. I told him that I was unaware of any such "government" and asked where this country was located. He stated that it was a "part of South Africa" and that he represented those people or groups that are presently unrepresented in South Africa, i.e. the black population of that country. After a brief discussion, it seemed clear that Mr. Puchard (he referred to himself as "Billy") was having difficulty expressing himself or that he was unaware of the reality of the situation. He had apparently written to the Department and requested that he be given a "number" registering himself as the "representative" of the above cited government. He told me that he needed a "number" so that he could "prove" to his attorney that he was in fact a representative of this foreign government. Since I did not have any written material before me, I asked Mr. Puchard if he could call back later after I had had the opportunity to see if I could locate his letter or letters. He said that he would.

The next day, September 5, I received a call from a Mr. Wayne Lichteig, New Mexico State Hospital (Forensic Unit) who inquired about my discussion with a Mr. Billy Lloyd Edwards. Mr. Lichteig explained that Mr. Edwards is a patient at the hospital undergoing testing to determine his mental stability and ability to stand trial (for an unknown charge). Mr. Lichteig explained that Mr. Edwards suffers from delusions and that he claims to be a representative of a foreign government, and, using the name "Puchard", apparently contends that he represents the Royal Democratic States of Continental Africa. After a brief discussion, it was agreed that I should speak with Mr. Edwards to explain as firmly and clearly as possible

(EXHIBIT C)

NOV 20 1985

Mr. Billy Edwards
722 West Third Street
Deming, New Mexico 88030

Dear Mr. Edwards:

I am in receipt of your letter dated August 7, 1985 to the Department of Justice relating to your request to be registered under the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938, as amended, as an agent of the Royal Democratic State of Continental African Government.

As I previously informed you, you cannot be registered under the Act unless you represent or act for an officially recognized foreign principal as defined by the above referenced statute.

Since by law we cannot register you, we must consider this matter closed. No further communication on this matter will be necessary.

Sincerely,

Robert D. Sharp
Attorney
Registration Unit
Internal Security Section
Criminal Division

(EXHIBIT D)

EMPEROR, BILLY L.E. PUNCHARD II
ROYAL CONTINENTAL AFRICAN
GOVERNMENT EMBASSY # 15.
702 WEST FIRST STREET
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030
(505) 546-4462 ,U.S.A.

(EXHIBIT D)

DIPLOMATIC LEGAL MAIL
MARCH 16,1994 TeleFax
(202)514-4371

UNITED STATES
JUSTICE DEPARTMENT
ATTORNEY GENERAL
Mis. J. REANO
CONSTITUTION AVE. & 10th Street N,W
WASHINGTON, D.C.
20530

DEAR Attorney General Mis. J. REANO :

GOD BE WITH YOU.

Pursuant to a Letter and Complaint Petition Mailed to the President of the United States on About MARCH 10,1994 showing a voice Tape of My Attempting to comply with the Congressional Code that require All Person In the united States that is acting as a Foreign Agent for Governments (foreign)to Registar with the Justice Department.

As Certified Foreign Government Agent Me and my Staff have been deprived of the Constitutional Right to comply with the Congressional Code and Law to Registar in the United States Justice Department by the head of that Department Mr. FRED CLOSE. We understand that EQUAL Protection under the Color of Law is a 14th Amendment Right. The Deprivation of the right to comply with the Law of the Land should not be the job of a Justice Department Clerk (Mr. CLOSE).

On and about 2,22,1994 My Embassy Telefaxed all Certifyed Agents Identification to the Registration Department for refiling. CLERK Mr. Close has received this Certifications with no Honorable Intent to file the Documents as he is required by law to do.

My Government request that your office see to the filing of the Documents without any Delay.
"I am trying to avoid a Federal Court Complaint on these Constitutional Rights belonging to us."
If you see filed..Please call the Royal Government EMBASSY (505) 546-4462 and state the Document have been placed on your computer Files for varacation of Registration and FAXED OVER TO THE Federsal State Department (Foreign Agent Registration Division).

THANK YOU. CROWN-AMBASSADOR Pro

(EXHIBIT I) Copy

(EXHIBIT I)

ROYAL CONTINENTAL AFRICAN GOVERNMENT
CROWN AMBASSADOR WILLIAM L. E. PUNCHARD II
ROYAL CONTINENTAL EMBASSY # 15
702 WEST FIRST STREET; P.O. BOX 227
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030
(505)546-4462 U.S.A
DIPLOMATIC MAIL
TELEFAX (505)546-7442

MR. BIN JOHNSON
WHITE HOUSE EXECUTIVE
OLD EXECUTIVE BUILDING
1600 Pennsylvania AVE. N.W.
WASHINGTON ,D.C. 20500

DEAR MR. JOHNSON:

GOD BE WITH YOU.

Pursuant to our talk on the Phone on the 4,25,94 here is the information needed to understand what my Problem Might be .

The Chief Clerk, Mr. Fred Close that is in the Registration Department of the Federal Justice Department has been removing Certified Documents of Foreign Agency from the Public record. This has been did with out any probable Cause Shown NoR Court Ordered removeal. Such Tampering with the Records By MR. Fred Close and his Department Co-Workers have Cost My Government A great deal of Money and has caused our Diplomats to be False-Imprisoned .

AS we understand the Registration Foreign Agents ACT of 1938, Mr. Fred Close is suffering from the Doctrine of None-Delagation (lack of Jurisdiction to interpose any Political obstacle). We Understand that he Nor his Office have Jurisdiction to opinio on any International Matter . Nor to Make Foreign Policy.

Mr Close's Office has Missled the Supreme Court on Several Cases when thay call to check registration.

For My Government not to go to Court for the Release of our Diplomats that are Damaged by Mr. Close. We would have to

(EXHIBIT I)

receive a Faxed Letter with a JUSTICE DEPARTMENT LETTER HEAD STATEING to Whome It May Concern: . The Registration of the Certified Documents for Persons having Diplomatic Immunity have been placed on Public Record in the United states JUSTICE Department and the same Telefaxed to the Registration Department of the United States State Department. The Identification of . the followern named Diplomats have been Registard

CROWN AMBASSADOR WILLIAM L.E.PUNCHARD II:
CROWN MINISTOR ,LELTON EDWARDS
CROWN MINISTOR, DENIST WILLIAMS
CROWN MINISTOR, BILLY L. E. EDWARDS
CROWN CONSUL General, YOLONDIA WRITE
CROWN CONSUL ROBERT HAYNES II

These Foreign Agents were registrd for the ROYAL CONTINENTAL AFRICAN GOVERNMENT . Most of which have been Registard for Five to Nine (9) years .

Name
Signed by Dept. Head

Mr. Johnson the replacing of the Record Taken would settle Our Problems along with the Letter Head from Mr. Closes's Office Or/and a Such Letter Faxed Stateing such with the Whitehouse Letter Head.

MY Telefax no. here is (505) 546 7442

I thank yoU MR. JOHNSON .

4.27.94

Crown Ambassador

Telefaxed to :(202)456 2983

SIXTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT COURT
COUNTY OF GRANTS
STATE OF NEW MEXICO

(EXHIBIT E)

93 OCT-P300
Lilie C. Maraba
Milisse Burcham
Deputy Clerk

State of NEW MEXICO,
Plaintiff,

Vs,

ROBERT HAYNES,
DEFENDANT.

No. Cr-93-16

ORDER DENYING DEFENDANT"S MOTIONS

this MATTER having come before the Court on the 28th day of September, 1993, upon the various Motions filed by the Defendant, Pro Se, and through his Attorney, H.R.Quintero, by the Court have considered the Testimony and Evidence Presented by the Defendant,...

IT IS THEREFORE ORDED THAT THE MOTION for Arrest of Judgement is hereby denied;

It is FURTHER ORDERED That the Motion for Writ of Habeas Corpus is hereby denied.

S/ V.Lee VESELY
District Judge

filed in a public office, or a purported public record, report, statement, or data compilation, in any form, is from the public office where items of this nature are kept.

(8) Ancient documents or data compilation.—Evidence that a document or data compilation, in any form, (A) is in such condition as to create no suspicion concerning its authenticity, (B) was in a place where it, if authentic, would likely be, and (C) has been in existence 20 years or more at the time it is offered.

(9) Process or system.—Evidence describing a process or system used to produce a result and showing that the process or system produces an accurate result.

(10) Methods provided by statute or rule.—Any method of authentication or identification provided by Act of Congress or by other rules prescribed by the Supreme Court pursuant to statutory authority.

Rule 902. Self-authentication

Extrinsic evidence of authenticity as a condition precedent to admissibility is not required with respect to the following:

(1) Domestic public documents under seal.—A document bearing a seal purporting to be that of the United States, or of any State, district, Commonwealth, territory, or insular possession thereof, or the Panama Canal Zone, or the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, or of a political subdivision, department, officer, or agency thereof, and a signature purporting to be an attestation or execution.

(2) Domestic public documents not under seal.—A document purporting to bear the signature in his official capacity of an officer or employee of any entity included in paragraph (1) hereof, having no seal, if a public officer having a seal and having official duties in the district, or political subdivision of the officer or employee certifies under seal that the signer has the official capacity and that the signature is genuine.

(3) Foreign public documents.—A document purporting to be executed or attested in his official capacity by a person authorized by the laws of a foreign country to make the execution or attestation, and accompanied by a final certification as to the genuineness of the signature and official position (A) of the executing or attesting person, or (B) of any foreign official whose certificate of genuineness of signature and official position relates to the execution or attestation or is in a chain of certificates of genuineness of signature and official position relating to the execution or attestation. A final certification may be made by a secretary of embassy or legation, consul general, consul, vice consul, or consular agent of the United States, or a diplomatic or consular official of the foreign country assigned or accredited to the United States. If reasonable opportunity has been given to all parties to investigate the authenticity and accuracy of official documents, the court may, for good cause shown, order that they be treated as presumptively authentic without final certification or permit them to be evidenced by an attested summary with or without final certification

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

IN THE MATTER OF
THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WRIT:
CASE CIV.APP. 95-5021: Conspiracy, Legal and Medical Mal-Practice, HABEAS CORPUS:

WILLIAM L.E. PUNCHARD II, LELTON EDWARDS, Y.G.WRITE, DENEST WILLIAMS, ROBERT HAYNES, BILLY L. Punchard III,

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,
Vs,
THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO, STATE Hospital, UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, AN AL,
RESPONDANTS.

A MULTIMOTION: (WRIT OF HABEAS CORPUS)

COME NOW, THE ATTORNEY AND PETITIONOR IN THE ABOVE NAMED CASE AND STYLE MOVING THE Honorable Court by Motion for a Release upon Docketing the Case in the Federal Supreme Court. The Respondants having no Federal Warrant as Required by Law, NOR Jurisdiction to their State Warrant, Pursuant to Federal Code 28 U.s.c.§1251. The granting is consistent with Justice ,Right and International Law (Treaty) When release is covering all Diplomatic Cases herein ,Diplomatic Familys Cases herein. Plaintiff thanks the Honorable Court.

PLAINTIFF-ATTORNEY-PRO SE.

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

IN THE MATTER OF
THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WRIT:
CASE CIV.APP. 95-5021: Conspiracy,
and Medical Mal-Practice, HABEAS CORPUS:

WILLIAM L.E. PUNCHARD II, LELTON EDWARDS,
Y.G.WRITE, DENEST WILLIAMS, ROBERT HAYNES,
BILLY L. Punchard III,

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,
Vs,
THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO, STATE Hospital,
UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, AN AL,
RESPONDANTS.

PETITION FOR A INDIVIDUAL JUSTICE

RULE 22.

COME NOW , The Attorney and Plaintiff in the above named Case Moves the Honorable Court for Individual Justice in this Matter. Justice · Ocono is Petitioned to jurisdiction this Matter., or Clarence Thoma Petitionor thanks the Honorable Court

Billy L. Punchard

Plaintiff Petitionor-Pro Se.

ATTORNEY FOR THE PLAINTIFF

WILLIAM L.E. Punchard II
COUNSELOR Pro Hac Vice
P.O.BOX 227
702 West FIRST Street
DEMING, NEW MEXICO 88030
TELE/FAX: 505-546-4462-15

THE RESPONDANTS ARE STATE EMPLOYED,
but TWO (2) Federal Employed .

ATTORNEY FOR THE RESPONDANTS

MR. TOM UDALL

ATTORNEY GENERAL FOR NEW MEXICO

P.O. DRAWER 1508

SANTA FE, NEW MEXICO 87701

APPEARANCE PRO HAC VICE , RULE 6(2),

PURSUANT TO THE PLAINTIFF'S NEGOTIATING

BOTH PARTYS HAVE THE SOVEREIGN RIGHT.
This Certiorari is submited on the Brief. Attorney will appear on Pro Hac vice if appearance is Necessary.

APP.14) William L.E. Punchard II

IN THE UNITED STATES SUPREME COURT

IN THE MATTER OF
THE ORIGINAL JURISDICTION WRIT:
CASE CIV.APP. 95-5021: Conspiracy,
and Medical Mal-Practice, HABEAS CORPUS:

WILLIAM L.E. PUNCHARD II, LELTON EDWARDS,
Y.G.WRITE,DENEST WILLIAMS, ROBERT HAYNES,
BILLY L. Punchard III,.

PLAINTIFF-APPELLANT,
Vs,
THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO, STATE Hospital,
UNITED STATES JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, AN AL,
RESPONDANT

CERTIFICATION OF SERVICE

Pursuant to Rule 22.

This is to Certify that I the Plaintiff-Petitionor in the above named case has mailed a copy to the Respondants's attorney on this Date 4,16, 1996

Wm Billy Lee Punchard

ATTORNEY -PETITIONOR-Pro Se.

(EXHIBIT J)

A SECTIONAL TIRE



REPRODUCTION OF THE ORIGINAL 1985



(APP. 16)

(EXHIBIT L)

A TENNIS SHOE WITH A Light.



22X"28"

Western hard canvis painting



(EXHIBIT K)

IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OTERO COUNTY
TWELFTH JUDICIAL DISTRICT ,NEW MEXICO

CAUSE NO. CR-95-197

DIVISION I

STATE OF NEW MEXICO,Plaintiff

v,

EDMUND WRIGHT,Defendant

JUDGMENT AND SENTENCE

THIS MATTER HAVE CAME BEFORE THE COURTon the 10th day of May,1995,for a Jury Trial the State of New Mexico being represented byRoxeAnne B. Matise, Assistant District Attorney, and the Defendant being Represented by Sam Damon ,and Defendant being Present,and the Defendant having been found guilty by a Twelve-Member jury for a Lesser included offense of Count I.:Resisting, Evading or obstructing an Officer,§30-22-1 NMSA 1978,a Misdemeanor, ...IT IS THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT that the Defendant is guilty of Count I:Resisting, Evading or Obstructing an Officer,§30-22-1,NMSA,a Misdemeanor.

IT IS THE SENTENCE OF THE COURT that the Defendant,EDMUND WRIGHT,be incarcerated in the Otero County Detention Center for a period of Three Hundred sixth-Four days as to Count I,commencing the 10th day of May 1996.

Sandra A.Grisham
DISTRICT JUDGE

(APP.19)